

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA	:	CRIMINAL NO. 1:04-CR-0287
	:	
v.	:	(Judge Conner)
	:	
ALTIMONT WILKES	:	

ORDER

AND NOW, this 22nd day of June, 2005, upon consideration of the motion for return of property (Doc. 63), filed by defendant *pro se* and seeking the return of property that was seized in Maryland, and it appearing that defendant is represented by appointed counsel in the above-captioned case (Doc. 26) and that a motion to return property “must be filed in the district where the property was seized,” see FED. R. CRIM. P. 41(g); cf. United States v. Parlavecchio, 57 Fed. Appx. 917 (3d Cir. 2003) (noting, “in passing,” that subsection (g) of Federal Rule of Criminal Procedure 41 “put[s] to rest any debate relating to the proper venue for a [motion to return property]”), quoted in Amadi v. United States, 220 F.R.D. 190, 192 n.2 (N.D.N.Y. 2004), it is hereby ORDERED that the motion (Doc. 63) and briefs in support thereof (Docs. 62, 64) are STRICKEN from the record in the above-captioned case without prejudice to defendant’s right to file a motion to return property in the appropriate judicial district.

S/ Christopher C. Conner
CHRISTOPHER C. CONNER
United States District Judge